

The Classical Bulletin

Vol. IV

DECEMBER, 1927

No. 3

Caesar "Talk"

Discussions about Caesar have an unfading interest, partly because first-high teachers must train their little legionaries to grapple with Caesar, partly because second-high teachers are always puzzling their heads as to whether something else than Caesar would not be more satisfactory, partly because senior teachers suspect that Caesar is the culprit to blame for their pupils' deficiencies in Latin. Views come and go, but no two teachers seem to blame or praise Caesar for the same reasons. I intend in this paper to bring face to face some of the many arguments that are urged both for and against the *Gallie War* as a high-school text. I shall confine myself to "talk" which I have heard, instead of tilting at men of straw manufactured for the occasion.

The most common objections are those which are based on the difficulty of Caesar. "It simply is beyond their capacity in November of their second year of Latin." "It is too hard even after four semesters of Latin." "Too much syntax is involved." "The sentences are too long, too complex, sometimes incorrect." "The result can only be haziness and a growing dissatisfaction in the student's mind; poor marks, a worried instructor; a lack of respect for the classics which the future cannot correct."

"Then too his language is so technical,—all about wars and such meaningless stuff." "Many of the words are useless for future reading."

"Caesar has the wrong moral attitude toward war." "Any measure is good enough for Caesar, provided that it works." "Caesar always wins. We cannot sympathize with him or the Roman cause on this account."

But the end is not yet. "Caesar's narrative, you must admit, is severe, cold, hopelessly dry." "He writes without soul, without style, without beauty of any sort." "He has no enthusiasm, no pity, no praise, no vividness, no consideration for a reading audience." "Caesar offers the teacher scarcely any opportunities for introducing moral lessons, or the discussion of human experiences in any way related to those of the students' actual life." "Do you think that we want to make cadets out of our boys?"

We have reserved to the end what is perhaps the most serious charge, namely, that Caesar prevents the formation of the habit of reading Latin. "Caesar repels the student and chills whatever ambition he may have to master Latin. He implants the conviction that Latin must always remain a test of endurance, never a source of literary pleasure. To stunt or deaden power

over the printed Latin word thus early is to kill all hope of enriching the boy's life with those gifts which the classics have a peculiar capacity to impart."

These indictments would be a striking challenge to our second-high Latin reading if they could be maintained as valid. Few of these statements, however, have more than superficial force. Thus, for instance, objections based on the score of difficulty are easily exaggerated. The matter may be found difficult because the method of approach is faulty. If through the study of a book like McNichol's "Fundamental English," your pupil has learned how to analyze a sentence in his mother tongue, and has acquired some idea of the use of conjunctions, his first great obstacle to the reading of Caesar is removed. It is the presence of subordinate clauses that makes Caesar seem difficult, but such clauses cause difficulty in Latin because they have not been mastered in English. Of course, really suitable transitional reading may be useful as a shock-absorber, but do not postpone Caesar indefinitely for the reason that he does not write in simple sentences.

The very difficulty complained of may be an advantage. Effort builds. The history of culture is a history of shattering obstacles to progress. Surely, then, the ideal curriculum is not that which aims to screen the rugged path to success with gaudy bill-boards. To shut out Caesar because of reasonable difficulty is to accept just such a thoughtless curriculum, at least in principle. No boy who has done a fair share of his duty leaves second high without having added enormously to his knowledge of Latin, and to his power over the language. The teacher is not just to himself if he feels that he has failed because his class has scored an average grade of seventy-five per cent in Caesar, whereas they might have scored ninety with easier matter. It does not take much business instinct to prefer seventy dollars in good gold to ninety in counterfeit currency.

The objection that Caesar's military vocabulary is useless for the rest of the course can be completely refuted by a five-minute perusal of Lodge's "Vocabulary of High School Latin," where it is abundantly demonstrated that Caesar's vocabulary is ideal for the beginner. Out of the 2,106 words found in the first five books of the *Gallie War*, 1,600 or 76% occur again in Cicero and Vergil.

Why worry if Caesar has the wrong attitude toward war? It is a typically Roman view-point—a key to the genius of Rome, whose military policy was so important in her history. Much the same may be said of the austerity of Caesar's style. Austerity, restraint, and plainness are characteristic features of Roman

character at its best. Caesar's "hardness" of style is to me a much more accurate index to Roman temperament and genius than the half-Grecian, and sometimes silly verbosity and veneer of Cicero. Who more than Caesar and Livy gives proof of that sterling Roman genuineness, virility, and sobriety? Here we should further note what a well-known scholar once pointed out, namely, that the very plainness and simple elegance of Caesar's style make it most suitable for second-high Latin. While strictly classical, it is yet free from the figures of speech and involutions of word-order that characterize the emotional periods of Cicero. Caesar's style is unornamental, to be sure, but it is not bald. It is a restrained, bridled style, chosen for the senatorial and cultured classes of Roman society, because Caesar, all-round man of affairs that he was, felt it to be the style most adapted to his purpose in writing his memoirs. We may reasonably conclude that this style is a revelation both of his own character as a public man, and of Roman character in general.

If interest comes from thrills, you will find the *Gallic War* a treasure chest. What youthful imagination can fail to find interest in the picture of a Helvetian horde, restless and roaming and leaving behind it a wake of fire? What boy cannot revel in the sight of the magnificent Roman adventurer who risked life and reputation in his determination to stem the avalanche? The second book is a pageant; tremendous issues, shrewd planning, hardy courage, desperate fighting, hair-breadth escapes, victory and catastrophe, generous praise of the foe, frank admission of Roman indiscretion, justice to all on the field, scorn of personal praise: a story so told that admiration for Rome mingles with pity for the vanquished and a hatred for war and its bitterness.

We have yet to deal with the contention that Caesar stifles any desire on the part of the student to do further reading in Latin, beyond the regular class assignments. The formation of such a reading habit would undoubtedly constitute a real test of mastery. However, is it at all reasonable to expect that our classes should wish to read standard Latin prose at the end of second high? A desire to read Latin beyond the amount prescribed comes only—if it comes at all—as the fruit of years of nurturing under the care of inspiring teachers. And by the way, what would you suggest as non-curricular reading matter for second or third high? What popular Latin literature is suited to the capacity and tastes of youth?

Much of the dissatisfaction in regard to the *Gallic War* springs from an abnormal focussing of attention upon largely imaginary difficulties. A little more contentment would pay rich dividends in worth-while results—even in Caesar.

St. Louis, Mo.

BERNARD J. WUELLNER, S. J.

Αἱ μὲν ἄλλαι πανηγύρεις διὰ πολλοῦ χρόνου συλλεγεῖσθαι, τὰς δὲ διελύθησαν, ἡ δ' ἡμετέρα πόλις ἅπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα τοῖς ἀφικνουμένοις πανηγυρὶς ἐστίν.—*Isocrates*.

Colometry and the New Testament

The last three decades have had many a delightful surprise for the students of Greek and Latin literature. The rubbish heaps of old Egypt are at last giving up their dead, and once again "light from the East" is flooding the world. The discovery of the Greek Papyri brought in its wake another and no less momentous discovery. The colloquial character of N. T. Greek is now beyond reach of cavil. The original language in which the writers of the Book of Books speak to us is only a segment of the non-literary, everyday, colloquial Greek spoken at the time of Christ. It is no surprise, then, that the events of recent years have stimulated interest in translation of the N. T. Students of the Bible are wondering, now more than ever before, whether it may be feasible to present the message of Christ to the modern man in an English translation different from the Versions in current use. I am not aware that the question so formulated has ever been a subject of discussion at our conventions, and it is not for me to open a learned discussion of this somewhat delicate theme; but I believe I can feel justified in thinking that it does seem possible to offer, if not the entire N. T., at least the Gospel narratives, in modern, popular, colometric, and, if possible, rhythmical English that would satisfy the scholar, delight the plain man, and turn to account the knowledge gained from the Papyri. I believe, moreover, that such a translation would bring the Word of God nearer to the hearts of men, without in the least derogating from its innate dignity.

I will limit myself here to a brief consideration of the use of colometry as applied to the N. T.

For us who live in times when the printed page brings the treasures of the world's literatures to our very doors and when silent reading has become one of the charms of a cultured life, it is difficult to conceive to what extent the ancients depended on their ear as a guide to literary appreciation. One may boldly say that all ancient composition, including the N. T., was primarily intended for the ear, rather than the eye. The old rhapsode travelled from city to city and with a genius for eloquent recitation would move his audiences to tears or terror, as the theme demanded, his own eyes streaming or his hair on end with fright. He was a public reciter of the national poetry. "Your fathers," says the orator Lyeurgus, "regarded Homer as so valuable a poet that they passed a law that every four years at the Panathenaea his epics, alone of all poets, be recited by rhapsodes." The statement of Lucian that Herodotus read episodes from his history to the throngs at the Olympian Games has been questioned, but certain it is that he read portions of his history to an Athenian audience in 445 BC. To-day the man of letters is the writer, and the writer of to-day differs from the speaker. "There was a time, as you know," says Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch (*On the Art of Writing*; p. 53.), "when the poet and the historian had no less than the orator 'to get a hearing.'"

Nay, he got it with more pains: for the orator had his senate-house or his law-court provided, whereas Thespis jogged to fairs in a cart, and the Muse of History, like any street-acrobat, had to collect her own crowd . . . A Hellene who deserted Herodotus, having a bet on the pentathlon, not only missed what he missed but missed it for life." The power and charm in the plays of the great dramatists were destined, as a rule, to be listened to once only—each drama on the particular occasion for which it had been composed. And in those plays how much there was to feast the ear, how little to satisfy the eye! At the opening of the *Clouds* of Aristophanes it is broad day in the theatre, but Strepsiades cries out, "By Zeus the King, this night-business—how long it is!" and the audience with a child's docility take the hint and promptly imagine night. In the N. T., the *Colossians* closes with this injunction: "When this epistle has been read to you, see to it that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans." The *Acts of the Apostles* relates how Philip on his way to Gaza met the chamberlain of Queen Kandake and "heard him reading the prophet Isaias." St. Augustine often visited St. Ambrose at his home in Milan and found him engaged in reading silently. "When he was reading," he says, "his eye glided over the page and his heart searched out the sense, but his voice and tongue were at rest: *vox autem et lingua quiescebant*." Augustine is at a loss to explain so unusual a phenomenon as silent reading.

Since ancient writing was composed mainly, if not exclusively, to be read aloud and listened to, it was natural that practical considerations, whether of rhetorical or liturgical, of a profane or sacred character, should soon force the teachers of the Classics and the persons entrusted with the reading of the Scriptures at public meetings to use Greek and Latin texts that divided the reading matter according to the sense. The result of these efforts was a gradual change in the current style of writing. The stichometric system yielded to a considerable extent to the colometric.

In the stichometric style the text was measured by the stichos which is the Greek term for our English line, and the length of the MS. was determined by the number of the stichoi it contained. In this style the text was written straight on without a break until the stichos was filled up. Each page of a MS. done in this fashion presented a solid block of written matter more or less uniform in length and width. In this arrangement no regard was had for such divisions of the text as the sense might require.

The colometric style, on the other hand, consisted in composing texts not by stichoi of approximately uniform length, but by lines the length of which was determined in each case by the sense. This division was made by breaking up the text into "cola" and "commata." Colometry, therefore, when opposed to stichometry, was division of the text according to the sense as opposed to division depending on mere space.

The early teachers of the Classics and the clerics in

charge of the public reading of the Scriptures could not fail to see the advantages of using colometric texts. The "scriptio continua" of a stichometric MS., especially when punctuation is wanting, offers considerable difficulties to any but the most skillful reader. In such a case, if the reader was expected to acquit himself of his task with ease and assurance, he must either know the piece by heart or else possess exceptional skill in reading a text not thoroughly familiar to him. The breaking up of the text into cola and commata, on the other hand, made it possible for any reader to see at a glance what words or phrases belonged together and were accordingly to be uttered in the same breath. At the end of the colon or the comma the reader was expected to pause and give himself a moment's rest without the hazard of tearing apart what was intended as a natural unit.

But correct breathing or pausing was by no means the only advantage to be derived from adoption of the colometric form of presentation. Greek and Roman audiences insisted on good reading: but good reading meant above all rhythmical reading. The ancients had a sure instinct for beautiful prose. Dionysius of Halicarnassus tells us that even "the unmusical, uneducated masses," had a feeling for melody: what does he argue from this? He argues that there is a touch of inborn affinity in all of us for beauty of melody and beauty of rhythm. Three factors conspired to impart harmony to Greek and Latin diction: accent, quantity, and structure. Of this trio, two elements were inherent in every word or phrase: accent and quantity, while the musical structure arose from a perfect arrangement of cola and commata.

(To be concluded.)

Cleveland, O.

JAMES A. KLEIST, S. J.

Videri—Middle or Passive

Videri is best known in the sense of "to seem" or "to appear." But there are passages in the best writers in which *videri* is passive and means "to be seen." The *Antibarbarus* quotes for this sense Caesar *Gall.* 2, 18, 3: "in aperto loco paucae stationes equitum videbantur." Cicero *fam.* 4, 10, 2 has this passage: "cum leviora non multo essent, quae audirentur, quam quae viderentur," where the contrast with *audirentur* makes the passive sense of *viderentur* certain. Tacitus *ann.* 13, 38 has this line: "unde videri magis quam audiri posset." The passive sense occurs repeatedly in late Latin. The same is true even of the combination of *videri* with an infinitive, as in Caesar *Gall.* 2, 28, 3: "ut misericordia usus esse videretur": "that he might be seen to have shown mercy." Compare also Cicero *off.* 1, 121: "ut id bono consilio fecisse videamur." *Videri*—"to be seen" is of frequent occurrence in Lucretius. Cicero in *de oratore* 3, 211 even ventures on "*videri debet*" in the sense of: "one must see, it must be seen," which is commonly expressed by *videndum est* or *videre oportet*. J. A. K.

Platon trouva la philosophie faite de brique, et la fit d'or.—J. Joubert.

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August and September by
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY PRESS
3441 North Ashland Avenue
Chicago, Illinois

Subscription price: One Dollar a Year.

Officers of the Classical Association

President.....Francis A. Preuss, S. J.
Secretary.....Hugh P. O'Neill, S. J.

The Classical Bulletin

EDITOR

James A. Kleist, S. J.
John Carroll University

1911 West Thirtieth St.....Cleveland, Ohio

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Francis A. Preuss, S. J.....Florissant, Mo.
William J. Young, S. J.....Milford, Ohio

BUSINESS EDITOR

Hugh P. O'Neill, S. J.....Florissant, Mo.

All business communications (subscriptions, etc.), should be sent to the Business Editor. Other communications may be addressed to any of the editors.

Entry as second-class matter applied for at the post office at Chicago, Ill.

Vol. IV

DECEMBER, 1927

No. 3

The Sixth Annual Meeting of the Ohio Classical Conference was held with the Classical Club of Greater Cleveland on November 10, 11, and 12. Besides the usual generous program of papers on subjects of classical interest, there were several notable features that made this meeting especially memorable. Prof. Constantine of Oberlin read a paper on "The Theory of Greek Music," which was followed by a lively presentation of "The Clouds of Aristophanes" by the Classical Department of Oberlin College. One afternoon was spent in a visit to the Cleveland Museum of Art where two illustrated lectures were given to the Conference; one by Prof. Cowles of Wooster on "Frontinus and the Roman Water System" and another by Mr. Howard, Curator of the Museum, on "Subjects of a Classical Nature in the Cleveland Museum." At the annual banquet President Emeritus Thwing of Western Reserve University addressed the Conference, with "Why the Classics?" for his theme. A novel feature was the Demonstration Class in First-Year Latin, conducted by Mrs. Olivenbaum of West High School, Cleveland. The Hildesheim Vase was awarded to Shreve High School, Martins Ferry, O. The attendance broke all records: from 110 (an unusual number for the first afternoon) the enrollment grew like an avalanche to the respectable figure of 340. The Ohio Classical Teachers clearly visualize their problems and vigorously tackle them. Encouragement and enlightenment were dealt out plentifully: no one had to go home empty-handed and faint by the wayside. "Adopt, or adapt!" was writ large across the five sessions of the Conference. Prof. Robinson of Ohio Wesleyan University succeeded Prof.

Hill of Ohio University as President. Next year the Conference meets at Dayton, O. *Societas Ohioensium quae vocatur Classica—vivat, crescat, floreat!*

What the Classics need in this country to-day is not defenders or propagandists. It is a characteristic fallacy of our time, rooted in the prevalent commercial spirit, that, as in business, so in education, the road to success lies through advertising. That the application of this principle has filled our halls of learning to overflowing, and made them a financial success, is beside the point. The success of an educational institution in its own proper field of imparting an education, is not measured by the number of students on its roster, nor by the size of its income, even though this may enable it to expand its campus and erect ever more costly buildings. The two elements which alone can make an educational institution a success, are a faculty of cultured men, enamoured of learning and inspired with the lofty ambition of enkindling in youth a passion for intellectual conquest, and a select body of young people, eager to learn and ready to apply themselves with seriousness to the work in hand. At present too many boys and girls are crowding into our schools of higher learning. Too many, rather than too few, are studying Latin. Of those who are studying Latin, altogether too few are studying Greek. The complaint has been heard at classical gatherings in recent years that men and women are teaching Latin who have little or no Greek. Many are teaching both Latin and Greek whose own knowledge of these languages is elementary, and whose acquaintance with Greek and Roman literature is not very extensive. What the Classics need, therefore, is not defenders—any truly worth-while subject is, in the long run, its own best and quite sufficient defense; nor is it propagandists—increase in the number of students studying the Classics is not wanted, and solid increase in the quality of the work done is not usually secured by methods of advertising and propaganda. No, what is wanted is a more thorough study of the Classics, a deeper appreciation of the Classics, Greek as well as Latin; and that, on the part of classical teachers even more than of classical students. If, then, we wish, as teachers of the Classics, to further the good cause as much as lies in our power, we can do nothing better than systematically improve our own knowledge of Greek and Latin by reading every day something in Greek and Roman literature that lies beyond the immediate, and perhaps narrow, compass of our daily round of teaching.

Reading Latin

(The second of a series of articles)

In teaching a pupil to read Latin as Latin, it is a mistake to launch him at once upon the open sea of a piece of normal Latin literature, where in the space of a single paragraph, he is likely to meet with any of the various syntactical constructions and varieties of word-order that are inseparable from even so-

called easy Latin. The reading of Latin is a very complicated process and demands so many different types of mental reaction that, unless these are practiced one at a time, confusion instead of mastery is the result. The pupil must be drilled upon individual and typical situations until his reaction to them becomes definite and methodical, if not entirely automatic. By "situation" I wish to designate a given construction found in a given place in a sentence, e. g. an accusative case at the beginning of a sentence, or an adjective separated from its noun. It is my purpose in this series of articles to take up a number of such typical situations and suggest for each a definite reaction. I would advise the teacher to make each reaction the subject of frequent drill until it becomes more or less habitual. The formal drill is, I think, best conducted by the blackboard method, but as each element of the reading process is mastered, it should be applied, at once and consistently, to the reading of the assigned author. It would be too much to expect that the regular reading of an author be postponed until the orthodox method of attack has been acquired by blackboard drill. The proper place, however, for the introduction of this method is in the very first months of the Latin course. Experience proves that the pupil who has been taught to prow around a sentence looking for subject and verb, is with difficulty cured of his nomadic habits later on.

Let us begin with what, as a concession to the English view-point, we may call the "inverted accusative" situation, e. g. *Murenam Sulla revocavit*. This perhaps, more than any other ordinary Latin construction, proves a stumbling block to the reading of a Latin sentence. The reason is, of course, that this situation has little analogy in English, outside of rather short sentences from which an inflected pronoun is rarely absent. Be it noted that the ease with which we understand such sentences as, "Money he does not desire," and "Him I shall always obey," afford a striking proof that a transposed word-order is not necessarily a cause of confusion in any language provided that the presence of inflected words, e. g. *he*, *him*, enables us to distinguish between subject and object. The fact, however, remains that in the absence of such inflected words, the first noun occurring in an English sentence is scarcely ever apperceived as the object of the action expressed by the verb. This mental bias is inevitably carried over into the reading of Latin, and unless the pupil is given a functional value for the ending of the accusative which will give it meaning at once, he will never be able to tolerate an accusative case at the head of a sentence. It is futile to tell him to "hold" the accusative "in suspense." He must be able to do something with it while he is holding it, or it will speedily elude his grasp.

In dealing with such a sentence as *L. Catilinam, furem audacia, scelus anhelantem, pestem patriae nefarie molientem . . . proscuti sumus*, it is a mistake to tell the pupil that he must keep the meaning

of *Catilinam* in suspense until the verb puts in its appearance. Such advice is equivalent to telling him that he must set the word aside temporarily and re-introduce it later on, when the appearance of the verb gives him opportunity to do so. This is only another way of telling him that he must re-arrange the sentence mentally.

The word *Catilinam* should be made to give sense immediately. It should mean to the reader, as it did to Cicero's audience, "There is Catiline and somebody did something to him." What was done to him and who did it, are questions that must be answered by succeeding words. The accusative ending is to be regarded as an embryonic sentence, meagre in actual content, but teeming with possibilities. This conception of the accusative gives the mind an attitude not so much of paralyzed suspense as of active expectancy. It provokes curiosity to find out what was done and who did it. It introduces action into the sentence from the very beginning. A thought in the mind is like a plane in the air; it must keep moving or it will fall. The brief appendage "and somebody did something to him" supplies the required motion. It is the only possible formula by which we can represent to ourselves the meaning of the accusative ending and be made to feel as the Romans felt when confronted by this inflection.

It is possible that at first sight, one is tempted to think that it is sufficient to say that the accusative ending indicates that the word to which it is attached is the object of a transitive verb. Such a viewpoint is fatal to reading. It takes the reader out of the world of ideas and buries him in the labyrinth of grammar. It is one thing to say that the word *Catilinam* is the object of a transitive verb, and quite another to say that the man Catiline is the object of an action. The first statement is static, lifeless; it has nothing further to suggest; it arouses no curiosity. The second statement is dynamic, living; it immediately inspires a set of questions: what was done? who did it? how was it done? when? why? This attitude makes Latin a living language. It is quite true that for the practised reader who is able to move with ease from the sphere of grammar to the realm of ideas and back again, our distinction may seem trivial; but let it be remembered that here we are trying to find a method of teaching reading to the immature high-school student. The writer once received the following translation for a well-known sentence in the second chapter of the First Catilinarian: "Caius Gracchus was killed by his illustrious father, his grandfather, and all his ancestors." This hapless pupil tripped on a rule of grammar, and since grammar was his only support, he came to grief. The case is an extreme one, but it illustrates what may happen when the mind of the pupil is focused on grammar alone. Are we then declaring war on grammar? By no means; but grammar should be explicitly emphasized only in its proper place, and that place is not during reading class. In grammar class a pupil may be required to give all the possible meanings for any given case ending; in reading class he should merely

answer the question: What does the context urge me to say, and will the grammatical form let me say it?

A difficulty now arises. If we teach the pupil to react to the accusative ending by the expression "and somebody did something to him," what will happen when the accusative represents some other function, e. g. when it represents the subject of an infinitive? The answer is this: we must teach the pupil one reaction at a time. When that reaction has become instinctive, the conscious attention of the pupil will be set free for the assimilation of another reaction, and so on until the whole field is covered.

I have chosen the accusative of direct object for the initial drill, because it represents the most frequent use of the accusative. If we eliminate accusatives after prepositions, which are easily segregated and are almost self-explanatory, we find, according to data contained in Byrne's *Syntax of High School Latin*, that 67% of all accusatives met with in Cicero represent a direct object. In 28% of its occurrences, it represents the subject of an infinitive, leaving only 5% for all other uses. It will not be difficult, when the time comes for it, to teach the pupil that the accusatives of time and space carry their own clues with them in the very meaning of the words in which they are found. Outside of Vergil, the adverbial accusative is limited practically to *nihil* and *multum*, which for purposes of reading may be catalogued as emphatic negative and adverb respectively. The only real difficulty is presented by the subject accusative. This will be dealt with in another exercise.

A blackboard exercise might be built up in the following way: Write the word *miles* on the board. Ask the class, "What does that word mean?" The answer will come back, "Soldier."

"Now what does this word mean?" Write the word *militem*.

"Soldier," will be the very probable reply.

"What! is there no difference between *miles* and *militem*?"

"*Militem* means soldier as object."

"Object of what?"

"Object of a preposition or transitive verb."

"What does that mean?"

It is quite possible that the class is so immeshed in grammar that no further response will be forthcoming. You will have to pry their minds loose from a hypnotic contemplation of the word *militem*, and get them to visualize a red-blooded warrior in full panoply. Then someone may have the courage to suggest that something happened to the soldier, somebody did something to him, and that is why the word that represents him in Latin must be in the accusative case. I may remark here that since our English expressions "to do something to" and "to act upon" etc. carry a supplementary preposition which may cause confusion, it might be well in the beginning to select some concrete verb, e. g. "to hit," which can be used to symbolize all transitive

action. The word *militem* will then mean "soldier and somebody hit him."

The following example will serve to crystallize the results of the lesson. Ten-year-old Tommy comes home to his mother with his left eye in partial eclipse. The mother's first thought is, "My son! Something has happened to him." At once she puts the question, "What has happened to you?" Tommy does not like to admit that he has suffered at the hands of nine-year-old Johnny next door, so he answers evasively, "Somebody hit me." Mother is not going to be put off. "Who was it?" Unwillingly comes back the answer, "Johnny." Let us apply this to the soldier. That ending *em* is his black eye. It indicates that he has been in conflict. Somebody did something to him. Now what might conceivably happen to a soldier? The class will be ready with suggestions, "Somebody killed him, wounded him, captured him." "What is the Latin verb likely to be when we come to it?" "*Interfecit, vulneravit*, etc." The teacher will then accept one of these suggestions and write the word *interfecit* on the board. "Who did the killing?" "The enemy, of course." "And the Latin word will be?" "Hostis".

It is well for the teacher to come to class with a number of such easy and natural sentences written on a slip of paper. Let this paper be deposited with one of the pupils, who will indicate the correctness of the hypotheses made by the other members of the class. The class will thereby be prevented from suspecting that the teacher is double-crossing them, when their "guesses" are not accepted. The most practical form of this exercise would consist in placing pairs of words on the blackboard, such as, *aegrotum medicus*, *arborem ventus*, *gladium miles*, etc. For each pair, the pupils should be required to supply a suitable verb. Such combinations should be chosen as will admit of only very few possible verbs. The experienced teacher will not need to be warned that an imprudent selection of examples can easily play havoc with the class discipline. This exercise will develop resourcefulness in forming forecasts, and will gradually lead the pupil to suspect that often enough the reason why a Latin verb can be left to the end of the sentence, is that it really is not needed except to tell the time of the action. The other words in the sentence frequently leave the verb little else to say. In like manner, an accusative can be paired off with a verb, leaving the subject as the unknown quantity. This will teach the pupil to anticipate the appearance of a subject that possesses logical affinity with the meaning of the verb, rather than grammatical concordance with its form. Concordance, of course, should never be overlooked. It should always be appealed to as a check upon the suggestions offered by the context, just as one tries a door, after having locked or unlocked it, in order to make sure that the key has functioned properly. The context must always remain the key.

Florissant, Mo.

HUGH P. O'NEILL, S. J.

Latin Accent

Why do so many Latin students in declining and conjugating say, for instance, *portá*, *portáe*, *portám*, *amábám*, *amabás*, *amabát*, etc.? I think one reason is because accent is not sufficiently emphasized in the beginning. Do not some teachers of first-year Latin go to the First Declension too soon, treating accent as a secondary consideration? Almost all Latin Books have an introductory lesson or two on Accent and Quantity. I believe that if these lessons are insisted on before the declensions are taken up, the mistakes so common in accent will diminish, probably disappear entirely. All pupils are wide-awake during the first Latin lessons. They are anxious to find out all they can about their new study, this *terra incognita*. So why not at this starting point along "the flowery road" of knowledge stress accent?

The rules themselves are simple, thus giving the pupils a favorable vista. Three words give the import of the rules—*never*, *penult*, *antepenult*; or, if the last two smack too much of formality, substitute *next-to-last*, *before-next-to-last*. English examples will further elucidate. Pronounce the word "very" by placing the accent on the last syllable. A bright boy says "veree" and the rest laugh. There's the "Never-Rule." In Latin never accent the last syllable. Now pronounce *porta* correctly. If a pupil says *portá* counter with "veree"; and his pronunciation is laughed down. Pronounce *portae*: the accent on the last syllable will be shunned. Pronounce *portam*. The stress goes on *por*—. Is it proper to say *amábám*? "Never"!

How then shall I pronounce the word—*amabam*—that I am writing on the board? Thus we lead up to the second, or "Penult-Rule." Again we may resort to English. Which syllable do we accent when we say "successful"? "The second-last." What is another word for the *second-last*? Penult. Would it be correct to say "súccessful"? No, because educated people say "succeśsful." If "—cess—" of "successful" is called the penult, how might we designate the first syllable, "suc—" ? As the *syllable-before-the-penult*, or, to use one word, *antepenult*. Now to our word on the board *amabam*. I may accent the penult and say *amábam*, or I may accent the ante-penult and say *ámabam*. Which shall I say? Again the bright boy answers, "What educated people say." No laugh this time. The answer is very correct, educated people say *amábam*. Why? Now listen attentively. Because the vowel in the penult syllable is long. If the vowel in the penult syllable of a Latin word of more than two syllables is long, that vowel will have a long mark over it. That is the only way you boys can now tell that it is long. So words of more than two syllables will have the accent on the penult if the syllable of the penult is long. Here we encounter the difficulty of words like *amavissem*, but these are so far along the "flowery road" that they may be set aside at this point.

So we have the *Never-Rule* and the *Penult-Rule*. Now for the "*Ante-penult-Rule*." It is the easiest of

all. Look at this word—*puero*. Shall we say *pueró*? Never. Name the vowel of the penult. "—e—." Has it a long mark over it? No. So it would be incorrect to say *puéro*. We have then only one other place to put the accent. We must say *púero*. If the word then has more than two syllables, we place the accent on the ante-penult when the penult is short.

What then are the rules for accent? And each one will answer, *etiam si sit natura tardior*, "never," "penult," "antepenult."

If these rules are taught during the first days of first-year Latin and abundant examples given with words that are shortly to be met along "the flowery road," one may be sure that a laugh will arise when the class hears *portá*, *portáe*, *portám*, *amábám*, *amabás*, etc. It is a safe guess that such sounds will never be heard, in that class at least.

Cincinnati, Ohio.

WM. T. BURNS.

A History of the Ancient World, by M. Rostovtzeff.

Translated by J. D. Duff. Vol. I, *The Orient and Greece*: Pp. xxiii and 418, with 5 maps, 90 plates, and 36 figures in the text. Vol. II, *Rome*: Pp. xv and 387, with 2 maps, 96 plates, and 12 figures in the text. Royal octavo. Oxford University Press, New York, 1926 and 1927. \$5.00 per volume.

This remarkable work in two large volumes is a monument no less to the scholarship of Professor Rostovtzeff than to the taste and enterprise of the Oxford University Press. From the standpoint of book-making, it leaves nothing to be desired. The print is large and pleasing to the eye; the plates—almost two hundred full-page reproductions of splendid photographs—are for beauty, accuracy, and completeness, beyond anything we have hitherto seen in a general work on history. The price is most reasonable in view of the size, workmanship, and numerous illustrations of the two volumes.

Professor Rostovtzeff wrote the present work in Russian, but as an introductory text for American university students. The translator has done his part excellently. On the whole, the treatment of the subject is philosophical, and proceeds by generalizations and comprehensive summaries. This is one of the outstanding characteristics of the work, and makes it very valuable for mature minds, especially for such as already possess a knowledge of the concrete facts, the details of time and place, the traditional stories of ancient history. The author evidently supposes that such knowledge has been previously acquired by his readers, as he either does not supply it in the text at all, or else does so in very summary fashion. The plates, however, to some extent save the situation for the beginner, as they abundantly supply the color and detail which the beginner needs to impress facts on his imagination and memory. Professor Rostovtzeff takes the purely historical point of view. This probably justifies his omission of details, though this economy makes the book somewhat less valuable for the classical student, who reads history largely

for the background which it supplies for his literary studies. In spite of the confidence which the undoubted scholarship of the author inspires, one is tempted to regret the absence of references to the sources from which he draws his conclusions.

The Orient receives much fuller treatment in this work than is commonly accorded it in college texts. The wonderful collection of plates makes the remote and hazy empires of the East live before the reader's eyes. Perhaps the influence of the East on the development of Greek culture is slightly over-emphasized.

The author shares the usual evolutionary views about the origin of man, the genesis of religion, the historicity of the Old Testament, etc., which one is accustomed to meet with in modern rationalistic works. For him the supernatural view-point in history does not exist. The professor's powers of analysis, however, and of philosophic generalization are so remarkable, that teachers of ancient history ought not to hesitate about purchasing the work under review. It will prove very helpful to them. Moreover, the plates form so splendid a collection of illustrative material and throw such a flood of light on ancient civilization in all its aspects, that for this reason alone, the two volumes are well worth buying.

Florissant, Mo.

FRANCIS A. PREUSS, S. J.

Books Received

From the Johnson Publishing Co., Richmond, Va.:

Second Year Latin, by Walter Eugene Foster, Ph. D. (Johnson's Latin Series). lxxvii + 631 pp. \$1.80.

From the Catholic University of America:

The Language and Style of the Letters of St. Basil. (A Doctoral Dissertation: Patristic Studies.) By Sister Agnes Clare Way, M. A., Washington, D. C. 1927. Pp. xiv + 229.

From the Oxford University Press (American Branch):

P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon Liber XII. With Introduction, Commentary and Vocabulary, by R. S. Lang, M. A. Pp. xxviii and 114. \$1.50.

The Life of Rome. Selected Passages from Latin Literature, translated by H. L. Rogers and T. R. Harley. Pp. xii and 264, with twenty illustrations. \$2.50.

C. Suetoni Tranquilli *Divus Vespasianus*, with Introduction and Commentary, by A. W. Braithwaite, B. Litt. Pp. xx and 73. \$1.50.

From Longmans, Green and Co., New York:

Hellenistic Civilization, by W. W. Tarn. Pp. vii and 312. \$6.00.

Would that I had pursued Greek till I could read and understand Demosthenes in his own language!—*Daniel Webster*.

Note on Translating "Whether . . . or" into Latin

Students often find it difficult to decide whether an English sentence containing a "whether . . . or" clause should be rendered into Latin by "utrum . . . an" or by "sive . . . sive." Most grammars do not give a clear and easy rule to cover all cases. The following is suggested as the simplest way to settle the point.

Rule I: If the "whether . . . or" clause is a *substantive* clause, and, in answer to the question "What?", gives either the *subject* or the *object* of the principal verb of the sentence, it must be rendered by an indirect question with "utrum . . . an" (or "utrum . . . necne," if the sense requires it.)

Rule II: If the "whether . . . or" clause is an *adverbial* clause and contains the answer to the question "Under what circumstances?", it must be rendered by the conditional "sive . . . sive," normally with the indicative in classical Latin.

Examples

(1) "I do not know whether he is dead or alive."

Question: "What do I not know?" *Answer:* "Whether he is dead or alive." This clause is the *object* of the verb "I do not know." *Therefore:* "Nescio utrum mortuus sit an vivat."

(2) "It matters not whether you speak or are silent."

Question: "What matters not?" *Answer:* "Whether you speak or are silent." This clause is the *subject* of the verb "It matters not." *Therefore:* "Non refert utrum loquaris an taceas."

(3) "Whether we live or die, we are the Lord's."

Question: "Under what circumstances are we the Lord's?" *Answer:* "Whether we live or die," i. e. "both if we live and if we die." *Therefore:* "Sive vivimus, sive morimur, Domini sumus."

To simplify matters still more, *Rule I* alone need be given to a class. If it cannot be applied to a given sentence, the "sive . . . sive" construction is required by exclusion.

F. A. P.

Understatement—Not Peculiar to the Greeks

To the Editor of the CLASSICAL BULLETIN:

I am taking advantage of your valuable columns to correct a slight inaccuracy which has found place in many books on classical Greek prose. There is a rather general tendency in books of this kind to speak of "understatement," such as is had, for example, in the $\delta\alpha\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ $\epsilon\iota$ construction, as a quality peculiar to the Greek tongue. The "I dunno" and "I guess not" of the New England farmers, signifying absolute negations, come to my ears daily as reminders that "understatement" is a nicety not entirely proper to the genius of the Hellenic tongue. Our most famous recent example to prove that the Greeks had no monopoly on "understatement," is Mr. Coolidge's well-known, "I do not choose," which, independently of any political interpretation, in classical New Englandese is equivalent to the absolute negation "I will not."

Weston, Mass.

J. P. CARROLL, S. J.

o
n
r
f
e
e
f
h
-
f
e
-
t
-
e